

Application No. 10/614,480
Amendment dated July 28, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 28, 2005

REMARKS

Status Of Application

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application; the status of the claims is as follows:

Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,201,617 B1 to Kusaka (“Kusaka”).

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,973,833 to Takada et al. (“Takada”) in view of U.S. Application Publication No. US 2003/0197799 to Dyas et al. (“Dyas”).

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Kusaka in view of the teachings of U.S. Patent No. 6,836,291 B1 to Nakamura et al. (“Nakamura”) or of Takada.

Claims 2-4 and 7-12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 13-20 are allowed.

The acknowledgement, in the Office Action, of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d), and that the certified copy of the priority document has been received, is noted with appreciation.

The indication, in the Office Action, that the Examiner has no objections to the drawings filed on July 7, 2003, is noted with appreciation.

Application No. 10/614,480
Amendment dated July 28, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 28, 2005

Objection to the Title

The objection to the title of the invention as not being descriptive is noted and a new title is presented in this Amendment which is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to include the limitations of dependent claims 2 and 7, respectively. These changes do not introduce any new matter.

Claim 3 has been amended to correct antecedent basis, in light of the amendment to claim 1.

Claims 8-10 have been amended to depend from claim 6 instead of now canceled claim 7.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejection

The rejection of claims 1 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kusaka, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 2, which was stated to be allowable. Claim 5 is dependent upon claim 1. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1 and 5 is now moot.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kusaka, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Application No. 10/614,480
Amendment dated July 28, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 28, 2005

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

The rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being obvious over Takada in view of Dyas, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 2, which was stated to be allowable. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1 is now moot.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Takada in view of Dyas, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being obvious over Kusaka in view of the teachings of Nakamura or of Takada, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Claim 6 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 7, which was stated to be allowable. Therefore, the rejection of claim 6 is now moot.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Kusaka in view of the teachings of Nakamura or of Takada, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 3 and 4 now depend from claim 1, which is considered to be allowable. Claims 8-12 now depend directly or indirectly from claim 6 which is considered to be allowable. Thus, claims 3, 4 and 8-12 are considered to be allowable.

CONCLUSION

Wherefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and an early reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Application No. 10/614,480
Amendment dated July 28, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 28, 2005

This Amendment does not increase the number of independent claims, does not increase the total number of claims, and does not present any multiple dependency claims. Accordingly, no fee based on the number or type of claims is currently due. However, if a fee, other than the issue fee, is due, please charge this fee to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260.

If an extension of time is required to enable this document to be timely filed and there is no separate Petition for Extension of Time filed herewith, this document is to be construed as also constituting a Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for a period of time sufficient to enable this document to be timely filed.

Any other fee required for such Petition for Extension of Time and any other fee required by this document pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17, other than the issue fee, and not submitted herewith should be charged to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260. Any refund should be credited to the same account.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Tung T. Nguyen
Registration No. 42,935
Attorney for Applicant

TTN/lb:jk
SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP
717 N. Harwood, Suite 3400
Dallas, Texas 75201
Direct: (214) 981-3478
Main: (214) 981-3300
Facsimile: (214) 981-3400
July 28, 2005

DAI 330282v.4